

Longwood University

Digital Commons @ Longwood University

Meeting Agendas and Minutes

Faculty Senate

11-10-2005

Faculty Senate Agenda 2005.11.10

Longwood University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.longwood.edu/facultysenate_meetings

Lydia Williams

From: Susan May [maysh@longwood.edu]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2005 9:32 AM
To: Faculty@longwood.edu
Subject: Agnda for the November Senate meeting



Minutes, October
13, 2005.doc ...



EPC report



NEW



OUTLINEFORCONC



Event

The Faculty Senate will meet on Thursday, November 10, at 3:30 in Rooms 147 A&B of the Library.

1. Approval of the minutes of the October 13 meeting (attached)
2. EPC Report (attached)--Ms. Menegoni
3. Discussion of the Event Classifications for Facilities Scheduling (attached)--Ms. Bratcher
4. Discussion of server security issues--Dr. Moore
5. New business

Susan H. May
maysh@longwood.edu
(434) 395-2169

Lydia Williams

From: baldridgems@mail.longwood.edu
Sent: Wednesday, November 23, 2005 10:29 AM
To: faculty@longwood.edu; staff@longwood.edu
Cc: maysh@longwood.edu; hallja@longwood.edu; brockservaisr@longwood.edu; keithsc@longwood.edu; tracypj@longwood.edu; wrightlb@longwood.edu
Subject: Re: Agenda items for the December Senate meeting

MEMO
TO: Faculty Senate and Longwood faculty
FROM: Mark Baldridge
RE: Agenda items for the next faculty senate meeting: 1. membership in faculty senate 2. re-visit parking permit fee increase

In the next faculty senate meeting, please include revision of membership to include only full time teaching faculty, meaning all administrators are excluded except when specifically invited for informational purposes only. I imagine this change would necessitate a by-laws change, but needs to be done if the faculty senate is going to truly represent the facultys' thoughts and wishes. When administrators are present at faculty meetings, it's only natural for faculty to be fearful of what they say/vote, and how they stand on issues, particularly when it might oppose what their "superiors" deem important. As a past senator, I have seen many examples of administrators applying determined and drastic pressure in a wide range of topics, often spiking it with inaccurate and untruthful distortions to insure faculty adopts their ideas. So it's difficult to stand for beliefs when you are at risk of how people above you might rule on your chances of tenure, promotion, merit pay, job assignment, etc. There truly is a "conflict of interests" issue here. If it is a faculty senate, it needs to be a "faculty" senate. Fortunately, we now (finally) have a great set of administrators who have either come from Longwood, or are totally committed to it. So, they already understand our problems, concerns and needs, and that this proposal is not directed toward them personally, but is simply a reaction of past and/or future problems. If Longwood is to grow, it needs maximum input and vision that can only be derived from the people it is to represent--- meaning faculty input on all levels. Criticism is always painful, but necessary for creative, intellectual environments.

The ramifications of a weak faculty senate have already evidenced themselves with two of the most important issues for us---the doubling of parking permit fees and the limitation of faculty thoughts (like this) via email. There was no true faculty input in either of these actions and this type of action will continue until we have a strong and unified faculty voice. While both may have been well intended, there are always creative ways to solve solutions when real input is sought.

Second, I propose the faculty senate establish its' own ad-hoc parking committee to re-evaluate the present structure to drastically reduce the present fee structure. Radford faculty pay \$50 per year for their parking privileges. Do they know something we don't? How are they doing it? There is no reason our fees can't be reduced to the prior year's level if we are unified in our determination. While there already is a parking committee, it does not truly represent faculty or staff. I do find it interesting and disturbing, that one reason the fee must be so high is because of bad planning. For instance, this past summer, the lines in the Bedford parking lot were repainted with great care and about two months later, the entire parking lot was repaved, then repainted for a second time. Apparently a parking lot near the science building was redone three times the previous year. It's frustrating to see a very nice and expensive parking lot destroyed for the newest building construction (near the tower dorms), since (apparently) "we" paid for the parking lot. However, we receive no compensation or credit for the needed spaces to replace those slots, meaning we paid twice. I fear these are not isolated incidents since it seems like we are playing "musical parking lots" as they change constantly, here and there, surely with great expense. I still contend that our jobs should not cost us money and since parking was not a problem until the huge influx of students over the past few years, they should bear the cost for four years instead of us for five to thirty years. See original objection below.

If other faculty (and staff) agree with these suggestions, I urge you to contact your

faculty senators and its' officers.

The memo below was originally "broadcast" to faculty and staff during exam week May 2005.

Hello All,

Hope you have a restful summer, we're going to need it. My bet is that when we return in the fall, the new substantially higher parking fees will be in place. While I was not present for these proposals at the Faculty Senate meeting last Thursday, I've heard that most faculty will be paying at least twice what we are presently paying. Studies were mentioned concerning parking at other metropolitan campuses and Longwood was "average", never mind that we still aren't truly metropolitan and are at the bottom or our peers for salaries. One proposal was that premium parking spaces would go for \$500. Regular parking costs will be pro-rated according to salaries, ranging downward from \$350 per year. Those making under \$20,000 will remain the same. I'd urge you to talk to your faculty senate representative to get exact figures. One interesting question is why were these proposals presented to the faculty at the very end of the year, when we are ready to scatter for the summer with little, or no chance of discussion or dissent. The senate was not asked for any vote, but now that we have been "consulted/informed", it can be touted that faculty had a chance for input. While other faculty/staff may have been involved in the decision making process, historically anyone placed on such committees is carefully screened avoiding those that would not agree with the pre-determined goals. Therefore, they do not represent the majority. In addition, staff and administrators cannot truly speak their minds since they could lose their jobs or suffer consequences if they make objections to their superiors. Reasons included the supposed state mandate that parking has to be generated from non-state money, yet there are usually other creative alternatives. For instance, the new construction will eliminate scores of parking places, so part of the budget (and plan) of that building should be replacement spaces, or include two or three levels of parking (perhaps underground), instead of being paid for by us. Or, don't allow students to park on campus at all, instead utilizing satellite parking.

I'm a believer that your job should not cost you money, and it now is. Parking was never an issue on this campus until recent years when great expansion has been occurring. While many are in favor of expansion, it should not be costing those of us who are the fundamental core of this environment. Those who benefit from this place, mainly the students, should fund it. I'd also bet the decision to go to Division 1 sports also has an impact, with additional playing fields and requirements consuming parking possibilities. I've nothing against this direction either, except it should not be costing us money. The bottom line should be, there was never a parking problem until the drastic increase in students, and so let them fund it. They will only be here for four years, unlike the others of us who loyally go about our responsibilities for years and years. What happened to the concern for faculty morale? We are already underpaid but hey, go ahead, and add more salt.

----- Original message -----

>Date: Thu, 17 Nov 2005 14:08:10 -0500

>From: Susan May <maysh@longwood.edu>

>Subject: Agenda items for the December Senate meeting

>To: Faculty@longwood.edu

>

>The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will meet on Thursday, December

>1 to set the agenda for the meeting on Thursday, December 8. If you

>have items for the agenda, please send them by Wednesday, November 30,

>to a member of the Executive Committee--Jackie Hall, Rhonda

>Brock-Servais, Stephen Keith, Pam Tracy, Linda Wright.

>

>Susan May

>

>Susan H. May

>maysh@longwood.edu

>(434) 395-2169

>